



GIS POLICY COMMITTEE MINUTES MARCH 15, 2005

County Employees and Members in Attendance: Steve Murray – County Surveyor; Khalid Hasan – GIS Administrator ; Mark Albers – Director of Highway; KD Benson – Commissioner ; Gini Nichols (Auditors); Carol Harbison; (Sheriff) Cinde Shockey – MITS (Recording Secretary) Rick Walker (Sheriff)

GIS Policy Meeting was held in the Tippecanoe Room of the Tippecanoe County Office Building at 10:00AM on Tuesday March 15th, 2005

Steve Murray calls the meeting to order.

GIS CONFERENCE 2005

Steve asked for Khalid to give everyone an overview of the recent GIS conference since he was unable to attend. Khalid begins by discussing the current state Ortho photography project. 20% of the state has been flown and the county will be getting new 6 inch color images later this year. Khalid discusses the information he collected while at the conference and says that many other counties are experiencing similar problems with their progress in regards to GIS. This encourages him that we are on the right track. KD Benson would like to know when they will be flying over our area. Khalid has a website where you can track the fly-over process. He will forward the link to all of the committee members. The Huck Finn project also allows grade school students to paint their playgrounds and submit their photos for publication on the website.

DIGITAL SUBMISSIONS

Steve hands out a draft of the new digital submission ordinance. So far digital submission has been voluntary and it seems to work fairly well however, an ordinance needs to be in place to ensure that no one refuses to submit their data digitally. Steve would like to have the draft submitted for first reading later this month. This ordinance would require the surveyors to file digitally anything they have to record through the auditors office. There were questions about format of data but as of now there isn't a set format. GIS wants the data to keep the property layers current. The draft is complete except for a disclaimer that the surveyors would like to have stating that the surveyor providing the digital data claims not responsibility for the accuracy of the digital data and not liable to the users of the data. Steve added the notation that this is not withstanding current Indiana code because they are liable for the surveys they do. Surveyors simply don't want to be liable for someone using the data to take legal action as the digital data is not as accurate as a land survey.

Gini would like to know if the surveyors will be required to submit the digital data the same day they record the paper copy. **Steve** agrees that this shouldn't be an issue for them to submit at the same time. **KD Benson** reads from the draft which states that the digital submission should be the same day and then the auditors have 30 days to review the information. This seems acceptable to everyone. Steve asks everyone to look over the draft and offer any comments or suggestions in the next few weeks. This has been a long process and he would like to have this completed.

GIS ACTION PLAN REVISION

Steve has been asking everyone for the last 6 months to look at the last action plan by PLEXIS. **Diane** and **Khalid** would like to revise the action plan this year to reflect what's actually going on. He would like for each department to consider any revisions to the original action plan that would benefit their department. **Mark** Albers asks the questions as to whether it's more important to establish goals for the public use or for the departments use. Steve addresses the question by referring the departments to analyze the areas of their department where they can reduce paper usage, foot traffic, and staff time providing information to the public. Surveyor office has had a large reduction in traffic with section corner information available online. Gini states that Auditors haven't seen a big reduction in foot traffic but internal traffic has decreased and realtors are using the information available online. **KD** suggests that Highway's high priority should be whatever will make their department more efficient and this will then also benefit the public. Mark states that each task they have worked on has been very daunting and he isn't sure whether to try to complete each large task or to move onto another project after some of the information is completed. **Steve** recommends finishing whatever will increase department efficiency first. Mark would like to have the right of way information available to everyone but lack of funding has been holding them back. Mark would like to outsource that rather than try to use internal manpower. Steve thinks that the work which needs to be done for right-of-way could possibly be done by a co-op student or part-time help. Mark makes the point that putting the lines down isn't the hard part it's deciphering the apparent right-of-way from the actual right-of-way. **Steve** recommends that **Mark** get digital project drawings from the consultant and pop those in for a beginning then work towards the more difficult projects. **Khalid** makes the point that it is mainly historical data that needs to be added and a plan should be developed to systematically attack the project. **KD Benson** states that she has sent the Purdue trailing spouse link to the members and there was a gentleman listed with GIS experience. **Steve** also suggests to mark that he can use funds earmarked for full-time positions which haven't been filled and transfer those funds to help pay for part-time help with GIS.

GIS DIGITAL SALES ORDINANCE

Steve has a summary of suggestions from local surveyors association in regards to sale of GIS data. **Khalid** hands out a summary of collections for 2004 data requests. Khalid has a list of prices from the surveyors group showing the comparison prices between different counties. We are very similar in pricing to Hamilton county. Some counties charge for access to the website. Khalid says we aren't getting large data requests because it's cost prohibitive. This ties up the GIS staff because clients are coming in numerous times for smaller amounts of data. Khalid puts it before the committee to decide whether to offer larger data sets at a cost savings to free up GIS staff time for other work. Steve makes the point that right now it's cheaper to buy the smaller portions and put them together than buying the larger data. The general discussion goes towards possibly selling data in large areas or maybe even the whole county at a reduced price to reduce the amount of time spent creating data for customers. Data can be organized in many different sizes and this needs further discussion to decide the best way to offer this to recoup the initial cost without limiting the work of our GIS technicians. This will warrant further discussions to decide the best way to approach this.